DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 154 652 HE 009 845

AUTHOR	Harari, Maurice
TITLE	Trends and Issues in Globalizing Higher Education.
INSTITUTION	American Association of State Colleges and Universities, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	Apr 77
NOTE	23p.
AVAILABLE FROM	American Association of State Colleges and Universities, One Dupont Circle, Washington, DC 20036
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 Plus Postage. HC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	College Curriculum; *College Role; Faculty Development; *Global Approach; *Higher Education; *International Education; *International Educational Exchange; Organizational Development; *World Problems

ABSTRACT

Summarized are the higlights of a series of five workshops held during the 1975-76 academic year. The workshops were devoted to the examination of the international role and responsibility of U.S. higher education. Highlighted are the topics of: mission, commitment, and institutional change; academic content and faculty development; and international exchanges, development, and linkages. In addition, a presentation by Michael J. Flack on the general theme is included. (MSE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED154652

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
AASCU
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

aascustudies

Trends and Issues in Globalizing Higher Education

American Association of State Colleges and Universities

Trends and Issues in Globalizing Higher Education

Maurice Harari

Published by the American Association of State Colleges and Universities, Suite 700, One Dupont Circle, Washington, D.C. 20036

Allan W. Ostar, Executive Director

Sandi McLean, Editor

April 1977

Table of Contents

Foreword

Preface

I. Highlights of Workshops

Mission, Commitment, Institutional Change

Academic Content and Faculty Development

International Exchanges, Development and Linkages

II. The International Reponsibility of U.S. Higher Education

by Michael J. Flack

Foreword

During the academic year 1975-1976 AASCU organized, in collaboration with a number of universities and regional organizations, a series of five workshops devoted to an examination of "The International Role and Responsibility of U. S. Higher Education." Some 300 individuals participated representing a wide spectrum of persons concerned with the theme of the workshops. While the majority of the participants were faculty members interested in or charged with the responsibility of developing international programs, the workshops also were attended by a number of college presidents and deans, federal officials, representatives from foreign embassies and public and private community leaders concerned with international-intercultural education. The substantial success of the workshops prompted the demand for a published summary of highlights, which, hopefully, will in turn generate examination of the issues and potential in international programs.

The following summary of highlights of the workshops, arranged by themes, was prepared by the staff of the AASCU Office of International Programs. A workshop presentation made by Professor Michael J. Flack, Professor of International and Intercultural Affairs at the University of Pittsburgh was selected for reproduction in this publication. While the views summarized here cannot be attributed to any one person, we are indebted to panelists, speakers and all the workshop participants--indeed, the relaxed and informal dialogue of the latter was probably the single most important reason for the success of the workshops. It is our hope that the contents of this publication will be useful to many educational leaders on and off-campus.

Maurice Harari
Director of International Programs

Preface

At some point in his enormously prolific writing Aristotle had occasion to observe, "No wind is favorable for a ship that knoweth not its destination." Roughly adapting this admonition to our interests in the field of international education, it seems to command that before beginning anything we should make a great effort to do our homework thoroughly: what do we wish to do in this area; what area of excellence in international education does each campus wish to be widely known for, ten years hence?

To achieve this considered goal, whatever its specifics may be, it is obvious that we must engender on the campus a solid sense of common mission, which may then be translated into statements of policy; which in turn can be honed into an administrative organization capable of successfully implementing the objective.

Indeed, it could well be said that we need everything - a full service spectrum, including both the soaring ideals of Socrates' ivory tower, and the operational guts of his marketplace.

Within this slender but important publication there can be found many of the clues needed to assist in our effort to make international education (however defined) a moving and significant force on our campus. Countless varieties of approach may, with equal validity, be essayed, while large amounts of money in most cases need not be required. Core considerations involve what we may wish to do, and how we may wish to do it; contained herein are many, many suggestions, and they will speak persuasively to those who read.

Francis N. Hamblin
President, Lock Haven State College
Pennsylvania
Chairman, AASCU Committee on
International Programs

I. Highlights of Workshops

Mission, Commitment, Institutional Change

The most important theme that emerged from the workshops revolved around concepts of "institutional mission," "commitment," and the process of "institutional change."

It became clear that there was a direct correlation between the general quality of education in an institution and the extent to which that institution had clarified its overall mission, established its priorities, and maintained its commitment to those priorities. The participants overwhelmingly endorsed educating students for a highly multicultural and interdependent world as one of the top priorities of U.S. higher education. This signifies that a commitment to infuse the entire campus with a global attitude toward issues and individuals is essential.

Regretfully, many individuals both within and without higher education were reported by the participants as conceiving of the "international dimension" as simply meaning a few American students going abroad or a few foreign students on campus. Others, equally simplistically, may think that traditional international relations courses, or the existence of a few courses on foreign areas, satisfies the need for the internationalization of education.

It was made repeatedly and abundantly clear by participants that this is not so. An additional course here and there, or a program of courses which reaches a limited number of students does not establish a genuine and lasting globalized education on campus. The international dimension is a global approach to the overall curriculum--especially at the general education level--and a global attitude on the part of the faculty, irrespective of discipline, in their role as value-oriented teachers or as experts in a particular field of knowledge.

While it was recognized that every single member of the faculty could not be expected realistically to endorse fully the international commitment of his or her institution, it was generally believed that a critical mass of the faculty, not necessarily a majority, with this commitment is essential. Such a group gives the institution the faculty impetus and support that makes the difference between a truly committed institution of higher learning and one which might give lip

service to quality education, but which responds only to the availability of a grant here or there that will support some program temporarily. In the latter, the program usually dies out as soon as the soft money disappears.

The clear articulation of institutional mission should result not merely from an editorial effort on the part of one, or a few individuals on campus, but from a consensus-building process involving a great many faculty members, administrators and students. Such articulation of institutional mission, accompanied by the coalition of interests which is part of consensus building, would, under the orchestration of quality leadership, result in constructive institutional change--change with a target, change for a purpose, and change realistically conducted within the overall framework of institutional objectives.

As John Marvel, President of Adams State College, said at the workshop held in Denver, Colorado, "We should devote more effort toward redirecting the energies of the faculty and administration. Funds generally follow commitment and we need to marshall our own resources, before seeking outside assistance. It must be seen not as another program to compete with, but one which transcends all program efforts." Indeed, there abound cases of isolated individuals who attempted to get funding for a particular program on their campus, or one that involved their institution and the broader community, either regional or international. In practically no instance has such an approach been successful, unless the potential donor could be satisfied that some serious process of planning and consensus-building had taken place on campus; and that the commitment of the leadership of the institution represented more than a pro-forma signature by a busy college president, possibly more interested in balancing the budget of his various constituencies than in developing an international/intercultural dimension throughout the institution.

Donors, be they the federal government, state agencies, private foundation, or even the business community, are usually much too astute to make grants for programs that would depend solely on such external funding. There is no better test of the commitment of an institution than insisting that is put down in kind, or in hard dollars, a certain percentage of the funds necessary to support the program, supplemented by an explanation of how it proposes to continue such a program and develop it in other directions, vertically or horizontally, after the external funding has been exhausted. Too many educational leaders have been at fault and have been irrevocably faulted by outsiders, as well as by their own colleagues, for taking the position which can be summed up as "I will support this program if it can be funded fully from the outside!" This is a paradox and a conflict of goals on the part of the leadership of the institution.

If a program is worthwhile and sufficiently central to the objectives of the institution, then it should be partly supported

by the institution, and indeed, fully supported, if that is possible. The rationale for seeking external funds should be that initially the program cannot be implemented fully without funding assistance, or that it needs to be deepened or strengthened and there are insufficient funds in the core budget of the institution to finance this process. To say that a program will be implemented only if every penny needed for it comes from the outside reveals an opportunism that is contrary to the very concept of clear institutional mission and program objectives.

Academic Content and Faculty Development

Major themes that were mentioned repeatedly in some of the workshops concerned the implementation of a more global academic curriculum, with discussion focusing on both the excellent developments that took place on some campuses and the obstacles which were encountered on others. In the first instance, it was not surprising to see a direct correlation between a clear sense of institutional mission, which included recognition of the imperative of international/ intercultural education and the quality of the academic curriculum. To the extent to which the institution flourished in overall quality, the international dimension could be seen as having been diffused throughout the institution in a variety of arrangements, as opposed to being isolated in a single department, or in a single center dealing with a topical area or with international affairs.

It became clear also that the smaller size or isolated location of an institution need never be serious obstacles to the development of international/intercultural curriculum content. A multi-ethnic student composition had a positive effect on the quality of the international/intercultural dimension. Some institutions with a large ethnic group, be it Black or Chicanon, have indeed developed strong intercultural dimensions which relate to the cross-cultural processes within U.S. society, as well as the relationships between these minority groups, the macro-society of the U.S. and larger global family of man.

In some of the larger universities which have international development activities in other countries, one test of successful commitment and implementation is the degree of collaboration in such universities between the professional schools and the departments of social sciences and humanities in relating usefully to developing countries. Even in some of the universities which have had considerable experience in international development with strong support from the U. S. Agency of International Development and other sources, it took some time before these universities realized how vitally important it was for their professional schools and their divisions of arts and sciences to collaborate in overseas programs.

In short, at the workshops it was established that there is no single way of infusing the international dimension on a campus, especially at the undergraduate level. It has been done through an area studies program, or through a topical program relating to one or more of the major issues confronting the survival of man. It has been done through comparative approaches to two or more societies and cultures. It has been done through cautiously combining the traditional ethnic heritage emphasis with a more traditionally international type of program; and it has been done through training in cross-cultural education within an appropriate community or region in the U.S. or abroad.

The essential ingredient for success in all of these endeavors was really not so much the way in which the activities were programmed, but the overall commitment of the institution: its support of the experiment, and the diffusion of the training and experience involved to a large mass of students and faculty within the institution. Programs overseas, whether they involve study abroad or the travel of faculty for educational purposes, were considered valuable as supplements, but never as a substitute to the overall commitment at home and the implementation of certain principles and values in the regular curriculum.

In view of the nature of international/intercultural education and the regrettable fact that some 90-95 percent of our current public school teachers have not had any in-depth exposure to non-western cultures, either through courses at home or through educational travel abroad, it was recognized that teacher education represents the single most vulnerable point in higher education. As a principal, but by no means exclusive target, it was thought that substantial efforts should be made by institutions of higher learning and by those responsible for the reform of higher education in the federal government, state agencies, private foundations and other sectors of society, to sensitize as many teachers as possible to issues of international and intercultural significance through both pre-service and in-service training programs. Fortunately, excellent research and surveys are available which underline the gravity of this particular deficiency in teacher training. Remedies are apparent, many of which can be implemented without additional resources. Others will require some initial funding. Again, the commitment of educational leaders, as well as those who support universities financially and otherwise, is essential to this critical reform of higher education.

The major foundation grants, particularly those of the Ford Foundation, have been targeted toward the large institutions and more specifically, toward area studies, with the hope that the international aspects of education would "trickle down" to the curriculum of all institutions. These objectives were sound but their implementation proved less practical. While major contributions toward the development of expertise in area studies and in comparative and international studies have been

made by the Ford Foundation, it became increasingly evident that the foundation approach was elitist: it did not provide sufficient support for the preparation of internationally-oriented generalists for the colleges, community colleges, secondary and elementary schools and, indeed, for teacher education institutions as a whole.

In more recent years, NDEA Title VI has been broadened and made more flexible in order to reach precisely those groups which have been neglected by the large grants made by the Ford Foundation to a few selected universities. However, the level of support for NDEA Title VI has not been adequate; a deficiency made more critical by the demise of the International Education Act of 1966 (passed by Congress but never funded). It was considered essential by the workshop participants to increase the level of funding for NDEA Title VI, and to continue broadening it, making it less elitist than it might otherwise be, and extending its value in the community-at-large through outreach and other types of programs. Participants foresaw a danger in limiting the use of NDEA Title VI funds to the large area studies centers where an ivory tower of experts may produce quantities of other experts who might sequester themselves in other ivory towers!

Within the overall rubric of academic content, the participants also pointed out the critical need for the production of educational materials which are free of stereotypes and of misinformation about other societies and cultures. This need was felt to be particularly acute at the pre-collegiate level. In addition, for purposes of outreach programs and interaction with the business community, the media, and other sectors of U.S. society, it was felt that faculty members could easily be trained to become highly productive and successful teachers and leaders with this expanded clientele. Here again, however, the teachers reported that they were handicapped by the lack of appropriate materials.

These teachers could be best and most easily trained as international generalists if they could attend four-to-six week institutes in the summer, or participate in some programs of equivalent nature during the academic year. Such programs would enable a general historian to introduce a serious African dimension into his or her teaching, or a sociologist to introduce the comparative knowledge of social organization and behavior in different cultures and societies. The expertise of an area specialist could be combined easily with that of a generalist in the same or different discipline in a seminar group or in a joint classroom venture to provide students with a more balanced, more appropriate, and more stimulating analysis of trends and conditions in different societies. These teachers could integrate knowledge: bringing into focus the relevance and dynamics of the fragmented information which a student quite often acquires in his or her first two or three years of undergraduate education.

International Exchanges, Development, and Linkages

EXCHANGES

It was reported that at the undergraduate level an increasing number of U.S. colleges and universities offer study programs with greater emphasis on features designed to appeal to the student as an individual. Cooperative sponsorship of programs seems to have increased. The increased number of exchanges and the variations in the world recession have heightened some of the inherent difficulties. For example, the problem of accomodating individuals whose salaries are lower than U.S. salaries, the matter of exchange rates and the problem of housing, including the special problems with Germany and other countries that follow different types of academic calendars. There is also the cluster of problems revolving around moving families. There are recurring problems when a specialists wishes to arrange an exchange with an institution in which someone in the same specialty will be available for research collaboration; or where the position at the home institution has to be filled by someone in exactly the same field. Finding the appropriate counterparts can be time-consuming and difficult. The matter of insurance benefits also keeps coming up. For example, many of the Europeans visitors come with the expectations of receiving the same benefits that they got at home--an issue which has not yet been satisfactorily solved in faculty exchange programs.

Some interesting programs were noted, such as the Visiting Fellow Program at the University of Colorado at Boulder. That program is partly funded by the National Bureau of Standards and partly by the University itself. Participants are associated with one of the two organizations and the program falls under the Department of Commerce. It is a line item which runs about $300,000 a year. Ten foreign and American Fellows are invited each year to participate. Under this program, visitors have been exchanged with Eastern European countries, Asia and other parts of the world.

The value of faculty exchanges was underscored as absolutely critical to the globalizing of education on campus, above and beyond the stimulating and refreshing experience which a faculty member gains from working in the professional field in a different cultural setting. Indeed, faculty exchanges were equated with the necessary and continuous rejuvenation of an institution.

U. S. STUDY ABROAD

American students going abroad for educational experiences is a field which continues to grow despite the vagaries of the recession.

The IIE publication, U.S. Colleges-Sponsored Programs for the Academic Year, describes about 650 study abroad programs at both the undergraduate and graduate level. This publication contains information on courses, costs, credits, housing, scholarships and language instruction. There are a number of study programs sponsored by private U.S. or foreign organizations which are not degree-granting institutions, as well as several privately sponsored centers abroad. There are approximately 700 summer study programs presently available, an increase of about 50 programs during the year 1975. The geographic spread seems to be widening and the number of opportunities to study overseas is increasing. More and more sponsors are developing programs focusing on specific aspects of the country's culture, such as theater in England or crafts in Scandinavia. A few programs, especially those sponsored by foreign institutions, also admit younger students.

In general, financial aid is not available to students who wish to study abroad at the undergraduate level except from their own institutions. At the graduate level, however, there are many grants offered by foreign governments, universities, and private donors.

FOREIGN STUDENTS

The number of foreign students coming to the U.S. keeps on growing; the total figure for 1975 was more than 200,000 students. A profile of the foreign student population in the U.S. shows an increase in the number of graduate students proportionately to undergraduates; and an increase in the number of students coming from the oil-rich countries.

This growth in the foreign student population in the U.S. is certainly a tribute to the quality of American higher education, and yet, a number of serious problems have been singled out as worthy of sustained attention.

One of these problems has to do with the irrevelance of some of the education a foreign student receives in the United States to the needs of the home society, particularly if the student comes from a developing country where manpower priorities need considerable attention. Apparently it is still true that the longer a student stays in the U.S. the less likely that student is to return home and be a productive member of the society. It is also a reality that in addition to their desire to have foreign cultures represented on their campus, many U.S. universities and colleges are attempting to improve their financial situation and diminish their overhead through the presence of foreign students. Despite this fact, however, our universities and colleges have not adequately addressed the issue of strengthening the academic fare which is made available to foreign students from the developing countries. To a certain extent, this results from having too few members of the faculty who have experience with developing societies.

It is by no means suggested here that the curriculum should be modified to suit the needs of foreign students at the expense of American students. Quite the contrary, it was believed by many of the participants that a good analysis of the curriculum, keeping in mind the needs of foreign students from developing countries as well as those of American students, was likely to produce a curriculum increasingly relevant to both. At the same time, under the guidance of the faculty the individual programs of the students should develop differently, reflecting the different needs. This is particularly true at the graduate level where the students has more options in selecting a seminar topic or in writing a master's thesis or a dissertation. Why not select a topic which is relevant to one's own region of the world and bring to bear the training, the methodology, the techniques, and the insights of the faculty on the specific problems of the developing society? Although it has been mentioned frequently, we still have too many doctoral students from developing countries writing library dissertations in the U.S. that have no relevance or real usefulness to the role they will play in their home countries.

Another issue, perhaps not unrelated to the first, has to do with the utilization or the maximization of the role of the foreign student on a typical campus. Where experiments have taken place to infuse the living experience of a foreign student into the curriculum under the guidance of experienced faculty, some very interesting and enriching results have occured. With more than 200,000 students from other countries in our midst, it is increasingly recognized that this enormous multi-cultural richness has not been used as a resource in our traditional academic processes, and the potential in that area remains great.

Allusions have been made to the fact that many U.S. universities and colleges are glad to admit foreign students because of the tuition income that they bring. This raises a number of questions with regard to the purposes of the institutions of higher learning, and their mission. It is very advantageous to have students from other cultures on our campuses. However, we know from considerable experience in this country that unless the institution is really prepared and committed to give these students the services which are minimally required to make them effective students, then the university should not plunge into this highly delicate dimension of intercultural education. To put it candidly, there are regrettably many campuses where foreign students are perceived as a financial benefit, bringing out-of-state tuition, not as students who have a contribution to make to the campus as a whole; and not as students who can be trained and educated to perform a valuable role in their home countries.

Other related problems revolve around the cluster of pressures brought about by state or federal regulations resulting from the broader recession in the U.S.; from the severe political dislocation which has occured in a number of countries, for example, Vietnam and Cambodia; and from the unemployment which has existed in the U.S. in recent years. The latter is probably the single most

important cause for federal regulations making it considerably harder for foreign students to obtain jobs and to work while studying. This is unfortunate as many of these students are otherwise unable to pursue their studies. Traditionally one of the great attractions of the U.S. has been, precisely, the opportunity for foreign students with very limited funds to earn part of their expenses, and to keep abreast of the soaring costs of higher education in the U.S.

The abrupt political changes which occur around the globe repeatedly place upon U.S. higher education severe strains which could be eased by more carefully and thoughtfully coordinating federal/private planning. An example was the status of Vietnamese and Cambodian students who were in the U.S. prior to the collapse of their governments, or who became refugees as a result. Despite the great concern of the private community, of educators and of others, including federal agencies, it took several months to analyze the problem, to generate possible solutions, and to implement programs. This happened despite the fact that it was known for quite some time that the emergency was bound to occur, or was likely to occur at some point.

The development of a campus program for foreign students that seeks to maximize their educational experience and to maximize the value of their presence to American students continues to present one of the real challenges of American higher education. One of the very excellent services which is available to American institutions of higher learning (and which regrettably is not sufficiently known to some of the institutions which need it most) is the NAFSA Field Service Program. The program, funded by the Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs of the Department of State, bring consultants to the campus to study and to advise on ways of strengthening the overall experience of the foreign student on and off campus.

SAMPLE SUMMARY OF SESSIONS ON EXCHANGES

One of the summaries of a session dealing with exchanges is reproduced below because it is representative of the themes and dialogues which characterized the session. It illustrates what happened continuously in the workshop, mainly the sharing of information on opportunities, on experimentations, and on the expression of concern for doing a better job in pursuing the ideals of higher education:

> St. Paul admonished us that we must guard three personal qualities: faith, hope and charity. We have in our context reversed these priorities.
>
> It appears that our outlook is based on faith. We believe, without a great deal of objective evidence, that the world is a teacher and perhaps the best teacher is a different world. An important corollary of this proposition is that the world

can act as a challenge and an agent of change on values, attitudes, and views of participants and observers.

These articles of faith were expressed in three different ways by speakers this morning. Dr. Richard Crabbs of the Council for International Exchange of Scholars believes that benefits accrue to American Fulbright scholars overseas and that foreign countries benefit from the expertise of the Fulbright American scholars. Getting involved is the problem, as there are some 3,000 applicants for the 500 slots available. The application process is similar to that involved in a promotion and tenure decision on our campuses, with the most important element of the application itself being the statement of project. The overseas agency, of course, makes the final decision. The Council for International Exchange of Scholars also assists in the placement of foreign scholars in university employment in the U.S. in the belief that such experience will prove valuable to all concerned.

Dr. Donald Nelson of Miami University (OH) expressed the hope that foreign students become integral parts of the universities they attend. The National Association of Foreign Student Affairs (NAFSA) has nurtured this belief as the foreign student population here has grown twenty-fold since World War II. This organization has become involved in every aspect of foreign student support, including assistance for the foreign student when he or she returns to the home country.

The NAFSA organization doubtless is on the right track. It is accumulating evidence to support the assertion that educational exchange is not a one-way street and that it can indeed contribute to world awareness through its cross-cultural communications workshops and other programs. There remains the problem of measuring clearly the benefits to be derived from foreign student exchanges, and the problem of recognizing and utilizing foreign student expertise on our campus.

Dr. Orville Jones of Northern Illinois University demonstrated what can happen when faith and work meet. The American Student Abroad program at Northern Illinois is obviously a model for such programs in the Midwest, if not the nation, and has developed, in large measure, from the perceptive, intelligent, decisive, and enthusiastic support offered that program by the University administration.

The expertise it demonstrates in curriculum development and promotion of foreign study is admirable and its product is undeniably first-rate.

Experiences such as those lead us to redouble our efforts in building international bridges. It is especially encouraging to note that in this era of financial emergency, international education is becoming an increasingly militant faith, capable of generating converts and from time to time re-kindling our own missionary zeal. In so doing we are raising our hopes for the future. But let us be careful not to let our strong faith and hope lead us to excess--someone may discover how much fun international education really is!

INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

In international development, it was generally felt that AASCU institutions have been missing a great opportunity to strengthen their level of international/intercultural expertise by failing to explore adequately ways and means of becoming involved in the development of other societies. This area traditionally has been the turf of the big land-grant universities and a few of the highly prestigious private institutions.

It is historically understandable that the universities of Africa or Asia, for example, would turn to Britain, France or Holland for curriculum and educational methods to adapt to their needs. When considering the U.S. as a source of development assistance, the developing countries, in conjunction with the U.S. Agency for International Development, automatically turned to the well-established land-grant universities and consortia. However, recent developments in the evolution of African and Asian universities demonstrate: interest in moving away from the European models they may have assumed in their infancy; interest in developing a more flexible curriculum, an area in which the U.S. is particularly experienced; and, interest in relating meaningfully to universities which are experienced in and committed to dealing with the development needs of society, particularly those institutions which stress practical application and outreach programs in addition to classroom theory.

In short, the trend and needs all point to the potential for a closer relationship between the developing universities of the lesser developed countries and the large section of American higher education which is typically represented by AASCU type institutions. While several AASCU institutions have had some limited programs in the developing countries, these usually have been small ad hoc programs that have faltered from insubstantial commitment at both ends. Indeed, even for the larger universities, the development of more meaningful, durable, and truly reciprocal

linkages has become a challenge; and the need for different modalities and attitudes clearly is emerging.

STUDY ON INTERNATIONAL LINKAGES IN HIGHER EDUCATION

During 1976, grants finally were obtained by the major associations of higher education, acting in concert, to study the overall nature of the future relationship between U.S. higher education and other countries, particularly the developing countries. As of this writing, the study had begun under the chairmanship of Dr. Fred H. Harrington, former president of the University of Wisconsin, with funding from the U.S. Agency for International Development, the Kellogg Foundation, the Ford Foundation, the Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs of the Department of State, and the Office of Education, Division of International Studies. It is undoubtedly the most significant effort presently underway to re-evaluate the entire area of international educational collaboration, and it involves the close cooperation of several national associations of higher education, including AASCU.

The purpose of the study is two-fold: to determine the needs of the developing countries in relation to American higher education by exploring views of leaders in these countries and in the U.S.; and to decide how American higher education can best respond to these needs in the contexts of international development and of globalization of U.S. higher education. A special report on the study dealing specifically with international development questions will be submitted to AID around June 1977. By the fall of 1977 a much broader report, addressing the overall responsibilities and opportunities of U.S. higher education in the international field, should be made available to the public.

One of the specific and major questions which is to be answered by the study committee has to do with the desirability of creating a new agency or inter-agency vehicle in Washington, D.C. to act as a central agent for information, the brokeraging of arrangements, and a variety of other services involving the developing countries, the developed countries, and U.S. higher education. It is anticipated that the broad report will be widely disseminated and encourage discussion in the academic communities of the U.S. and abroad, and also in a variety of federal, state, and private agencies and foundations.

The report should include the presentation of a rationale for the future international posture of higher education and the vehicles that will be needed to discharge more effectively the responsibilities inherent in the globalizing of U.S. higher education. It is increasingly clear that the future globalization of U.S. higher education and the strengthening of its linkages with other countries must involve an interface with the agencies of federal and state governments, as well as with other sectors of U.S. society, such as the business community, the media, and public school education.

II. The International Responsibility of U.S. Higher Education

by Michael J. Flack
University of Pittsburgh

No matter how one may look at it, mankind is now passing through one of those significant, possibly decisive transformations in history, as a result of which things basically change and a new era is discerned as emerging. What is also significant--and is accentuated by the mirrorings of the media to us, and within us--is that large segments of the world sense this transformation, sense the rapidity and basicness of these changes, and experience the advancing desuetude of many past understandings, practices, and values. Some in the developed West meet it with rejection and foreboding, others with detachment or alienation. Some, very few, meet it with a sense of excitement and promise.

All three of these reactions are understandable: the abandonment of, and the feeling of being abandoned by the comfortable "old" (for those for whom it was confortable), is unsettling and warrants nostalgia. The rapidity of contradictory, systemless inventions, novelties and crises is enervating, confusing, and dispiriting, and does lead to withdrawal and estrangement. But, those with more extended eyes see a "world" which, for the first time in history, has ceased to be merely a geographic and transportational expression, and has become a whole global mass of humans--some four billion of them--with common ambitions, performances, and dignities which, until not so long ago, were assumed to apply only to the white, educated, industrialized, urban, middle-class, Judaeo-Christian, northern hemisphere vanguard of our type of kinsfolk.

Problems, blunderings, and meannesses abound. But also, is it not true that at no time before in human history has such a large percentage of humanity been in the process of becoming literate, attending school, and benefitting from improving health. Also, never before have so many people been governed by their own leaders, whether we like them or not; written, read, and studied their own newspapers and literature; built their own societies; expounded their opinions; and demanded in an expanding range of fields a recognition of their own selfhood and of their own share of dignity.

Never before has this been so. Until the last three decades, the world, politically and socially, was a reflection of categoric decisions made by the upper strata of less than 10 countries; and life for 90 percent of mankind, in Thomas Hobbes' accurate phrase, tended to be "short, brutish and nasty". These emancipations--even though partial and not infrequently painful--have come so precipitously that many in the West--on the lucky

periphery of suffering, and, until recently, the intermittently benevolent Lords of the Ring--find the changes breath-taking and threatening.

We must attempt to take a step outside this fear. For, beyond its confusion, danger, and pain, this is also a heroic time: a time of world re-construction and an age that, in the next several decades, will lead from the ethnocentric through the polycentric stages of vision, interest, and organization, to a new order that, while as yet hard to comprehend, will be geocentric: all-human, global.

All of us here are among the privileged: active, mature, more or less open, able to learn and raise up by more than a notch the levels of our possibilities, knowledge, and contribution. For many of us, our agenda projects to the year 2000. For some, a stretch beyond. But those who have studied with us, whom we have taught, even those to whom we now give tenure, will spend a considerable part of their lives in the 21st century--a mere 23 years away!

We can confidently state that the 21st century will see and reflect a world unlike any that preceded it--one that probably will differ substantially from what guides and moves us today. In this connection, many questions arise. Let me raise just two: what animates the evolving spirit of our time and what does this presage? And what kind of persons will be needed, and what kind of social and educational issues will arise as men move to the ramparts of tomorrow?

A broad-gauged look at the two issues might suggest the following. Since the spread of Christianity, the Western world (and through accelerated diffusion in our own time, also much of the rest of the world) has been engrossed, to use Nietzche's term, in a vast and encompassing "transvaluation of values." What that refers to is an ethical revolution of categoric proportions. Please, note: in old Rome, the word "rich" connoted "good, kind, noble, gracious, friend of the gods;" and the term "poor" implied "lousy, dirty, no-good, bum." As the result of Christianity, originally itself the religion of the underdogs, there has evolved over time a full reversal of these meanings--a "transvaluation"--so that today, in large parts of the world, Christian or not, the word "rich" tends to mean "exploiter and blood-sucker," and the term "poor" the "good, the meek, the weak, the victims, the beloved of God." The social and political ramifications of this transvaluation are manifest: they reflect themselves in the latent or actual potency of various forms and messages of social justice, socialism, and democracy as a political as well as social and economic aspiration. It has expanded the classical call for the untampered and vouchsafed liberty of the individual to the broadest layers of society; and exerted pressure for the implementation of the other two components of the famous Triad, equality and fraternity (sometimes at the cost of liberty).

In a sense, this should not be too distant from the type of American heritage represented by Tom Paine, Thomas Jefferson, Walt Whitman, and other American equalitarians. Having imbibed of the Judaeo-Christian transvaluation, the intellectual ideologies of the American, French, Soviet, and, in adapted respects, Chinese revolutions, have discovered and located the individual in and as part of mass society; and have sought to present the emancipation of individual man as linked with the emancipation of society as a whole.

In this respect Americans fully joined mankind in the turmoils and continuous birthpangs of mankind only decades ago. Separated by two oceans, immensely inventive, masters of a most provident continent, beneficiaries of the rebels, malcontents, new beginners, and intellectual and manual migrants from the more rigid parts of the world, we peopled America in the belief that we are basically different: a society and history in a new edition. And, in some respects, we were. After the last world war we moved in on the world--disturbingly, subversively as regards privilege, creatively, and in some respects, intimidatingly. It may be that now the world is moving back on us; requiring us to reexamine and adjust the massive technological, industrial, scientific, ideological, and emancipatory structures and ideas we have profferred--not only abroad, but also in our own land.

We now talk of interdependence. What kind of policies, decisions, casts of mind, and ethical outlooks and orientations does that require? Will it be possible to go on focusing over time on "national" interest as the guidelines of policy, or will it require sensitivities to bi-national, multinational, or even global interests and criteria above the hallowed guidelines of the past? How do we make reciprocal consideration of each other a single criterion?

We also now talk of "space-ship earth," a fragile little planet with limited resources, beset by pressures for a more global allocation.

And we now talk of world-wide human rights for all races, for both genders, for children, for the aged, for the underprivileged and the blessed alike. Yet, are we ready to fathom the duties which this implies for each unto the other, for the parts to the operative whole? In fact, even many of our concepts seem obsolete. We still talk and think of "inter-national relations": interests and relationships external or interstitial to our inner lives inside our states; meeting in touch or conflict only on the periphery, like billiard balls. Yet, in fact, no one state, even the largest, is any longer wholly the unit of independent decision; and the only meaningful and increasingly unavoidable environment is the one globe itself in which states are the internal actors within a wider whole, like Indiana or Pennsylvania within the U.S. Only when we reorient our minds to think of world affairs as not the external relations of states and societies, but as the internal relations of mankind will we begin to come closer to the expanding present reality.

What does all this mean for education?

The world now counts some 155 officially independent units. When the process of global decolonization (which started with this country exactly 200 years ago) is completed, as it almost is, all of us will face for the first time a world in which coordinate, not superordinate-subordinate relationships between persons and component societies and state organizations, will be the command of the day.

Some of us, and definitely many of our children when they grow up, will find our careers lived and transacted in more than a single society. They will find their families increasingly ethnically and internationally composed. They will find their video, press, and literature drawing increasingly on a world pool of diverse sources of human creativity and malfeasance. They will find that as some of us from this continent go abroad as experts, advisers, and lecturers, increasingly many will be coming here to do the same for us. There will be increasing reciprocity. It will be not only the occasional gurus and Hare Krishnas, but city planners and scholars, ship-builders and philosophers, dancers and architects, engineers and ecologists. It will not be a one way, nor even a two way street. In fact, we shall have, at ever increasing levels, town-meetings en masse--the growing many with the growing many.

How shall we cope with the diversity of cultures while discerning the common core? How shall we converse and contract with others in their countries beyond our single tongue? How shall we discern the generic in our practices, institutions, and inventions beneath the specific forms and shapes that our own and each other civilization has given them? How shall we develop and evolve, in a world of global aspirations and standards, institutions that can continue to serve local and national needs without eliciting and justifying local passions and hostility? How, in our field of attention, shall we conceive of the role of universities and colleges in the world of the year 2000, when probably some five thousand institutions will be producing vast numbers of varyingly awakened and ambitious experts and teachers on a more crowded planet where knowledge will need to be linked to attitude and service, and where social survival and constructive cooperation along lines of complementarity will be the categoric imperative of the age?

We who are now in education are preparing people who will, for at least a third of their lives, live in the 21st century. It will be a global century. It will be a century in which intelligent social coordination--and yet personal self-expression and creativeness--will claim the major effort of those who will have to lead.

It is not too early to ask these macro-questions. It is not too soon to examine what we now do for its bearing on tomorrow.

While education--the internal education of mankind--is the realm of momentary retrenchments and financial cuts, there is no way this conglomerate human globe can function without more of it, without more competence and sensitivity in it, without more global realism to it.

That global realism requires a basic recasting of what we call the liberal arts, of what is contemporary professional education, and of what is the present guiding image of the educated man and woman--generalist and specialist.

Education will have to engage millions. It will need to ask the question: How do we fashion, internally and internationally, a socially responsible aristocratic education for a globally democratic society?

Directly and indirectly, we all shall have to be concerned with this question.

To cope dynamically with the problems of today, we must envision the necessities of tomorrow. Let them serve as guides for both vision and actions.